



HIKMA Fact-Check Report

Comprehensive authenticity analysis and verification

Paper Verified

‘The Law Speaks for the Silenced’: Trust, Moral Witnessing, and Communicative Authority in the South Africa v. Israel Genocide Proceedings (2023–2024)

3.0 out of 10

OVERALL FACT SCORE

X REJECT

RECOMMENDATION

15

CLAIMS VERIFIED



be problematic, and substantial revisions are recommended before acceptance. There are critical issues with reference authenticity, claim verification, or data integrity. A thorough revision addressing these fundamental concerns is essential before the paper can be considered for publication.

Overall Assessment:

3 out of 10


Reference Authenticity

Verifies that cited references exist and are correctly attributed

0.0

out of 10

Score Distribution



0: References are fabricated or non-existent

10: All references are verified and correctly attributed


Claim-Reference Alignment

Checks if claims accurately reflect the content of cited references

0.0

out of 10

Score Distribution



0: Claims completely misrepresent the cited sources

10: Claims perfectly align with cited source content




0: Numerical data contains major inconsistencies

10: All data is internally consistent and accurate

Scientific Consensus

Evaluates if claims align with established scientific consensus



Score Distribution




0: Claims contradict established scientific consensus

10: Claims fully align with scientific consensus

Hallucination Check

Detects fabricated or unsupported statements



Score Distribution



0: Contains fabricated or unsupported statements

10: All statements are well-supported and verified



AI Scholar Frontier

Advanced Research Verification & Knowledge Discovery Platform



AI SCHOLAR FRONTIER





statements, court filings, and media reports."

Ref Auth

0 out of 2

Alignment

0 out of 2

Data

0 out of 2

Consensus

1 out of 2

Halluc

1 out of 2

Final Score: 4.0 out of 10

Notes: No source provided for dataset size or composition.

Claim 2

UNRELIABLE

"Quantitative analysis reveals correlations between empathetic framing and perceived legitimacy ($r = 0.63$)."

Ref Auth

0 out of 2

Alignment

0 out of 2

Data

0 out of 2

Consensus

1 out of 2

Halluc

1 out of 2

Final Score: 4.0 out of 10

Notes: No source or methodology for calculating correlation provided.



0 out of 2

0 out of 2

Data

0 out of 2

Consensus

1 out of 2

Halluc

1 out of 2

Final Score: 4.0 out of 10

Notes: Dataset provenance and access not verified.

Claim 4

UNRELIABLE

"Legal filings demonstrated higher rates of procedural language (78%) compared to media reports (42%)."

Ref Auth

0 out of 2

Alignment

0 out of 2

Data

0 out of 2

Consensus

1 out of 2

Halluc

1 out of 2

Final Score: 4.0 out of 10

Notes: No source for percentages or coding methodology.



Data

0 out of 2

Consensus

1 out of 2

Halluc

1 out of 2

Final Score: 4.0 out of 10

Notes: Subjective claim without empirical source.

Claim 6

UNRELIABLE

"African sources accounted for 32.7% (720 entries) of the dataset."

Ref Auth

0 out of 2

Alignment

0 out of 2

Data

0 out of 2

Consensus

1 out of 2

Halluc

1 out of 2

Final Score: 4.0 out of 10

Notes: No source for regional breakdown figures.



Data

0 out of 2

Consensus

1 out of 2

Halluc

1 out of 2

Final Score: 4.0 out of 10

Notes: No source or methodology for correlation calculation.

Claim 8

UNRELIABLE

"The keyword 'Genocide' appears 4,520 times in the dataset (6.2% relative frequency)."

Ref Auth

0 out of 2

Alignment

0 out of 2

Data

0 out of 2

Consensus

1 out of 2

Halluc

1 out of 2

Final Score: 4.0 out of 10

Notes: No source for word frequency counts.



0 out of 2

0 out of 2

Data

0 out of 2

Consensus

1 out of 2

Halluc

1 out of 2

Final Score: 4.0 out of 10

Notes: No source for sentiment analysis methodology or results.

Claim 10

UNRELIABLE

"The dataset is available as an open-source CSV dataset under public license on Kaggle."

Ref Auth

0 out of 2

Alignment

0 out of 2

Data

0 out of 2

Consensus

1 out of 2

Halluc

0 out of 2

Final Score: 2.0 out of 10

Notes: No URL, DOI, or dataset identifier provided for verification.



Data

2 out of 2

Consensus

2 out of 2

Halluc

2 out of 2

Final Score: 6.0 out of 10

Notes: Factually correct but no reference provided in text.

Claim 12

NEEDS_HUMAN_REVIEW

"The 1948 Genocide Convention establishes legal obligations for state parties to prevent and punish genocide."

Ref Auth

0 out of 2

Alignment

0 out of 2

Data

2 out of 2

Consensus

2 out of 2

Halluc

2 out of 2

Final Score: 6.0 out of 10

Notes: Accurate statement but lacks citation to Convention text.



Data

2 out of 2

Consensus

2 out of 2

Halluc

2 out of 2

Final Score: 6.0 out of 10

Notes: Publicly known case but no reference to ICJ filings provided.

Claim 14

UNRELIABLE

"Qualitative analysis used NVivo software for thematic coding."

Ref Auth

0 out of 2

Alignment

0 out of 2

Data

0 out of 2

Consensus

1 out of 2

Halluc

1 out of 2

Final Score: 4.0 out of 10

Notes: Methodological claim without supporting documentation.



Data

0 out of 2

Consensus

1 out of 2

Halluc

1 out of 2

Final Score: 4.0 out of 10

Notes: Compliance statement without evidence of review or approval.



Reference Audit

Show Details 

Total References:

0



Data Audit

Numeric Items Checked:

15

Mismatches:

- All quantitative claims lack source alignment
- Percentages and counts in tables have no cited source
- Correlation coefficients unsupported



Figures & Tables Audit

Items Checked:

10

Caption-Data Mismatches:

- All table data lacks source references in text or references



⚠ Missing Items:

- No IRB/ethics approval mentioned for research involving sensitive content
- Claims of GDPR compliance without evidence

Fact-Check Metadata

Model: deepseek-chat

Max Claims: 20

Domain: Genocide Studies

Paper ID: review_20251127_215451